



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,591	10/08/2004	Hendrik Klaas Kloen	NL02 0327 US	9251
24738	7590	04/11/2006	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTH AMERICA CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS 1109 MCKAY DRIVE, M/S-41SJ SAN JOSE, CA 95131			CHU, CHRIS C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/510,591

Applicant(s)

KLOEN ET AL.

Examiner

Chris C. Chu

Art Unit

2815

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-6.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

See Kenneth Parker

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that since the first insulating material (51a) of in the recesses (64) of Tsuji et al. is not the same material as the encapsulating resin, hence Tsuji et al. can not be combined with Jung et al. This argument is not persuasive because Tsuji et al. clearly discloses in e.g., column 15, lines 66 - 67 the first insulating material (51a) being constituting a part of the resin portion 23. Thus, Tsuji et al.'s first insulating material reads as the encapsulating resin.

Furthermore, applicant argues that the encapsulating resin portion (23) is separated from the recesses (64) by various layers(51b, 52) of Tsuji et al., so the encapsulating resin cannot be anchored by those recesses. This argument is not persuasive because Tsuji et al. clearly discloses in column 16, lines 8 and 9 that the pole terminal portions 28A have an anchor effect to the first insulating material which has a same material as the encapsulating resin. Since, the first insulating material (51a) of Tsuji et al. reads as the encapsulating resin, hence the Tsuji et al.'s encapsulating resin can be anchored by those recesses.

Finally, applicant argues that the intent of Tsuji et al. would be destroyed when modifying Tsuji et al by Jung et al. because the encapsulating resin portion (23) of Tsuji et al. is separated from the recesses (64) by various layers(51b, 52). This argument is not persuasive because Tsuji et al. shows in e.g., Fig. 21C and column 16, lines 8 - 9 the encapsulating resin being anchored by those recesses and Jung teaches e.g., Fig. 2 nothing more than lengthening the bottom surface of the encapsulating resin (220) to extend as far as the bottom surface of the substrate (230 and 232) and not covering the bottom surface. Thus, it is an easy motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to lengthen the bottom surface of the encapsulating resin (23) of Tsuji et al. by filling the encapsulating resin material into the recesses (64) of Tsuji et al. to have a similar plane as the bottom surface of the substrate (28A) as taught by Jung et al. Thus, Tsuji et al. can be combinable with Jung et al. and the intent of Tsuji et al. wouldn't be destroyed.

For the above reasons, the rejection is maintained.